

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow is respectfully requested. These comments are intended to advance the case to issue without delay. The claims in the application were 1-9, 11, and 13-27. By this amendment, claims 22-26 are cancelled as they are directed to non-elected subject matter and claim 11 has also been cancelled. Accordingly, the claims now in the application are claims 1-9, 13-21, and 27. Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary and the text of the Office Action indicate that claims 10 and 12 are pending, however, these claims were cancelled in the amendment filed on November 22, 2002.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, and 27 in accordance with the Examiners advise and request in the Office Action. More specifically, parenthetical text have been stated without the use of parenthesis and spelling has been changed to conform to U.S. standard.

In the Office Action it is noted that claim 10 recites broader language for the iron chelator than its independent claim 1. Claim 10 has previously been cancelled in the amendment filed on November 22, 2002. Accordingly, applicant does not provide further comment regarding the prosecution of claim 10, as it is no longer relevant to this application.

The Office Action further states that claims 9 and 11 should specify which if the three iron chelators in claim 1 is to be further selected since using broader language now that the chelator is limited to a group of three substances is confusing. Applicant is unclear what is confusing with regard to claim 9. Claim 9 clearly recites an additional claim limitation that the iron chelator (whichever one is chosen from claim 1) has a binding coefficient for iron (III) of greater than 10^{26} . With regard to claim 11, claim 11 is cancelled by this amendment and thus this claim is not considered further.

In the Office Action, applicant is asked to provide an explanation of what is meant by "derivative thereof" in claim 19, part (b). Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would understand this to refer to materials that are derived (or made) from a polyhydric alcohol.

Claims 6-21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because multiple dependent claims cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-21 do not contain any multiple dependent claims that depend from another multiple dependent claim. Applicant submitted a preliminary amendment dated January 17, 2001 along with the originally filed application. The preliminary amendment eliminated any multiple dependencies. Accordingly, applicant respectfully request that this objection to claims 6-21 be withdrawn.

In view of these amendments, withdrawal of these objections and rejections is respectfully requested.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin J. Stein
Registration No. 47,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KJS/sa
(201) 840-2394